

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

4
5
6

8
9

11
12
13

1
2 EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY
3

4 A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted between Examiner Phillip
5 C. Lee and Keith W. Saunders on 08 December 2006. Applicants' representative
6 thanks the Examiner for the courteous Interview.

7 Independent claim 6 was discussed by way of example only. The applied
8 art of Gai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,651, 101) was also discussed.

9 Applicants' representative respectfully indicated that "no art of record
10 associates service classes to and/or classifies content information responsive to
11 user selection of a particular video object."

12 Examiner Lee disagreed and indicated that this was not a sufficient
13 distinction over the art of record. He further indicated that subject matter from
14 pages 14-15 of the Specification of the instant Patent Application could be
15 amended into the claims to further differentiate them from the art of record. The
16 Examiner also cautioned that further consideration of the art as well as an update
17 search would be required.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 RESPONSE TO 35 U.S.C. § 101 REJECTIONS

3
4 The current Office Action rejected claims 12, 13, and 19-24 under 35
5 U.S.C. §101.

6
7 The propriety and legitimacy of these rejections are hereby respectfully
8 traversed. Nevertheless, to facilitate the prosecution of the instant Patent
9 Application and to expedite its ultimate allowance as a U.S. Patent, these
10 rejections have been addressed by amending claims 12, 13, and 19-24.

11
12 It is believed that the amendments overcome the instituted 35 U.S.C. §101
13 rejections. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejections is hereby
14 respectfully requested.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

2
3 The pending claims, after entry of this current Reply, include element(s)
4 involving (i) one or more prioritizing parameters reflecting that the particular video
5 object has a relatively higher priority than other ones of the video objects, (ii) the
6 particular video object being allocated a relatively higher portion of available
7 bandwidth, (iii) the higher portion of available bandwidth enabling the particular
8 video object to be provided to the remote device with relatively better perceptual
9 visual quality, and (iv) the selective outputting of at least one packet of content
10 information based on a priority associated with the service class associated with the
11 packet of content information such that the available bandwidth is allocated in
12 accordance with the priority associated with the service class (e.g., for claim 1).

13
14 In short, it is respectfully submitted that no art of record, either alone or in
15 any combination, anticipates or renders obvious at least the above-identified
16 element(s) in conjunction with the other elements of the independent claims.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CONCLUSION

2
3 It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims 6-13, 19-28, 30-32,
4 34, and 35 are allowable, and prompt action to that end is hereby requested.
5

6 If any matters remain that prevent issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all
7 pending claims in the instant Patent Application, the Examiner is hereby
8 respectfully requested to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicants.
9

10 Respectfully Submitted,

11
12 Date: 13 April 07

13 By: Keith W. Saunders
14 Keith W. Saunders
15 Reg. No. 41,462
16 (509) 324-9256 x238
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25